



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,270	09/30/2002	Akira Ohmura	106121.07	2234
25944	7590	07/27/2007	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			HERNANDEZ, NELSON D	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2622		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		07/27/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/065,270	OHMURA, AKIRA
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Nelson D. Hernandez	2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,3-5,12,14 and 17-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,3-5,12,14 and 17-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 October 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/576,221.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                             |                                                                                         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                 | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                        | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 26, 2007 has been entered.

### ***Specification***

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The Examiner acknowledged the new title (Digital Image Storage System Having Docking Station With Communication Indicator) filed in January 26, 2007 as been acceptable. However, with the claims as now amended the title is no longer clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. The Examiner acknowledges the amended claims filed on June 26, 2007. **Claims 1 and 3-5 have been amended. Claims 2, 6-11, 15 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 19-24 have been newly added.**

***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claim 1** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1, 3-5, 12, 14, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 in view of Anderson, US Patent 6,507,363 B1 and further in view of Kawamura et al., US Patent 5,899,581.**

**Regarding claim 1,** Berstis discloses a digital image storage system (See fig. 1) comprising: a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214 and fig. 4) capable of storing digital images; a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera can be placed to transmit digital images stored in the digital camera memory through the docking station; and a data storage (by teaching that the images are transmitted to a server or a computer system, Berstis inherently discloses a data storage having a storage medium for storing the digital images since a storage medium; col. 2, lines 40-46; col. 4, lines 53-63) having a storage medium that stores the digital images transmitted through the docking station, the data storage having a housing that is separated from a housing that has the docking station (by teaching that the images

are transmitted to personal computer (fig. 2: 219; col. 2, lines 15-39), Berstis inherently discloses that the data storage has a housing that is separated from a housing that has the docking station (fig. 1: 106), since a housing is an inherent feature of a personal computer) (Col. 1, lines 45-50; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 29-63).

Berstis does not explicitly disclose a controller that controls the data storage so that the transmitted digital images are stored in a predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium and that the controller automatically prepares a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder.

However, as taught in figs. 10 and 11, Anderson teaches a method and system for generating a plurality of folders for multiple devices and multiple sessions in a digital camera wherein when a camera is going to transfer image data to a second camera, the second camera would create a new folder to store the images sent by the first camera (Col. 8, line 18 – col. 9, line 15). Anderson also teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium (in fig. 1, Anderson teaches creating subfolders or session folders with the motivation of avoiding the complexity of searching for a particular image as the number of stored images increases; col. 6, lines 50-62). Creating a folder for receiving the images in an external apparatus is advantageous because it would allow efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoids name conflicts.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Berstis by having a controller that controls the data storage so that the transmitted digital images are stored in a predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium and to have the controller preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the digital image storage system by allowing efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoiding name conflicts as suggested by Anderson (Col. 9, line 37 – col. 10, line 3).

Although the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder (col. 6, lines 50-62), the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson fails to teach that the controller automatically preparing said subfolder within said predetermined folder.

However, Kawamura et al. teaches an electronic camera (Fig. 1) that automatically creates a subfolder in the memory of the camera based on a selected mode or parameter in regards to the image taken. As shown in figs. 8 and 9 a folder (i.e. 804) may have different subfolders that are automatically created based on whether sequential images are captured and said sequential images are stored in said folder (Col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33). Kawamura et al. also teaches an embodiment where the folders are automatically created based on the compression rate applied to the images and wherein the camera creates inside said different folders for different compression, subfolders for sequential images (Col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis and Anderson by having the controller to automatically prepare a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to possibly judge from the directory name and file name information about modes or parameter used when the images were captured as suggested by Kawamura et al. (Col. 5, lines 29-33).

**Regarding claim 3,** the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. teaches that the controller names the subfolder based on a date when the controller prepared the subfolder (Kawamura et al. teaches naming the folders (i.e. 802, 803, 804) based on the date the images were taken; see fig. 8; col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33; col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19).

**Regarding claim 4,** Berstis discloses a digital image storage system (See fig. 1) comprising: a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) having a memory (Fig. 2: 214 and fig. 4) capable of storing digital images; a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera can be placed for transmission of the digital images from the digital camera memory; and a data storage (by teaching that the images are transmitted to a server or a computer system, Berstis inherently discloses a data storage having a storage medium for storing the digital images since a storage medium; col. 2, lines 40-46; col. 4, lines 53-63) having a storage medium that stores the digital images that have been

transmitted from the digital camera memory through the docking station, the data storage having a housing that is separated from a housing that has the docking station (by teaching that the images are transmitted to personal computer (fig. 2: 219; col. 2, lines 15-39), Berstis inherently discloses that the data storage has a housing that is separated from a housing that has the docking station (fig. 1: 106), since a housing is an inherent feature of a personal computer) (Col. 1, lines 45-50; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 29-63).

Berstis does not explicitly disclose that the data storage includes a controller that prepares a folder in the storage medium in advance of the transmission of the digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the folder and that the controller automatically prepares a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder.

However, as taught in figs. 10 and 11, Anderson teaches a method and system for generating a plurality of folders for multiple devices and multiple sessions in a digital camera wherein when a camera is going to transfer image data to a second camera, the second camera would create a new folder to store the images sent by the first camera (Col. 8, line 18 – col. 9, line 15). Anderson also teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium (in fig. 1, Anderson teaches creating subfolders or session folders with the motivation of avoiding the complexity of searching for a particular image as the number of stored images increases; col. 6, lines 50-62). Creating a folder for receiving the images in an external apparatus is

advantageous because it would allow efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoids name conflicts.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis by having a controller that controls the data storage so that the transmitted digital images are stored in a predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium and to have the controller preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the digital image storage system by allowing efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoiding name conflicts as suggested by Anderson (Col. 9, line 37 – col. 10, line 3).

Although the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder (col. 6, lines 50-62), the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson fails to teach that the controller automatically preparing said subfolder within said predetermined folder.

However, Kawamura et al. teaches an electronic camera (Fig. 1) that automatically creates a subfolder in the memory of the camera based on a selected mode or parameter in regards to the image taken. As shown in figs. 8 and 9 a folder (i.e. 804) may have different subfolders that are automatically created based on whether sequential images are captured and said sequential images are stored in said folder

(Col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33). Kawamura et al. also teaches an embodiment where the folders are automatically created based on the compression rate applied to the images and wherein the camera creates inside said different folders for different compression, subfolders for sequential images (Col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis and Anderson by having the controller to automatically prepare a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to possibly judge from the directory name and file name information about modes or parameter used when the images were captured as suggested by Kawamura et al. (Col. 5, lines 29-33).

**Regarding claim 5,** limitations can be found in claim 3.

**Regarding claim 12,** the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as applied to claim 1 teaches that the controller is housed by the data storage (Anderson discloses creating the folders in the second camera; col. 8, line 18 – col. 9, line 15; see also col. 4, lines 35-46).

**Regarding claim 14,** the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as applied to claim 4 teaches that the controller automatically prepares the folder in the storage medium in advance of the transmission

of the digital images (See Kawamura et al., col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33; col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19).

**Regarding claim 17**, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as applied to claim 1 teaches that the docking station has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera (See Berstis fig.1, docking station 106 has a shape to fit a bottom part of the digital camera 102; col. 2, lines 15-39).

**Regarding claim 18**, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as applied to claim 4 teaches that the docking station has a shape to fit a bottom of the digital camera (See Berstis fig.1, docking station 106 has a shape to fit a bottom part of the digital camera 102; col. 2, lines 15-39).

**Regarding claim 19**, Berstis discloses a digital image storage (See fig. 1) capable of receiving digital images from a digital camera (Fig. 1: 102) through a docking station (Fig. 1: 106) on which the digital camera can be placed, the digital image storage comprising: a storage medium (by teaching that the images are transmitted to a server or a computer system, Berstis inherently discloses a data storage having a storage medium for storing the digital images since a storage medium; col. 2, lines 40-46; col. 4, lines 53-63) that stores the digital images that have been received through the docking station (Col. 1, lines 45-50; col. 2, line 15 – col. 3, line 8; col. 4, lines 29-63).

Berstis does not explicitly disclose a controller that executes a program to prepare a folder in the storage medium in advance of receipt of the digital images from the digital camera and to store the received digital images in the folder, wherein the

controller automatically prepares a subfolder within the folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder.

However, as taught in figs. 10 and 11, Anderson teaches a method and system for generating a plurality of folders for multiple devices and multiple sessions in a digital camera wherein when a camera is going to transfer image data to a second camera, the second camera would create a new folder to store the images sent by the first camera (Col. 8, line 18 – col. 9, line 15). Anderson also teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prepared in the storage medium (in fig. 1, Anderson teaches creating subfolders or session folders with the motivation of avoiding the complexity of searching for a particular image as the number of stored images increases; col. 6, lines 50-62). Creating a folder for receiving the images in an external apparatus is advantageous because it would allow efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoids name conflicts.

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis by having a controller that executes a program to prepare a folder in the storage medium in advance of receipt of the digital images from the digital camera and to store the received digital images in the folder and to have the controller preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to improve the digital image storage system

by allowing efficient generation and retrieval of images from folders and also avoiding name conflicts as suggested by Anderson (Col. 9, line 37 – col. 10, line 3).

Although the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson teaches preparing a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder (col. 6, lines 50-62), the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson fails to teach that the controller automatically preparing said subfolder within said predetermined folder.

However, Kawamura et al. teaches an electronic camera (Fig. 1) that automatically creates a subfolder in the memory of the camera based on a selected mode or parameter in regards to the image taken. As shown in figs. 8 and 9 a folder (i.e. 804) may have different subfolders that are automatically created based on whether sequential images are captured and said sequential images are stored in said folder (Col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33). Kawamura et al. also teaches an embodiment where the folders are automatically created based on the compression rate applied to the images and wherein the camera creates inside said different folders for different compression, subfolders for sequential images (Col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Berstis and Anderson by having the controller to automatically prepare a subfolder within the predetermined folder prior to the storage of the transmitted digital images and stores the transmitted digital images in the subfolder. The motivation to do so would have been to

possibly judge from the directory name and file name information about modes or parameter used when the images were captured as suggested by Kawamura et al. (Col. 5, lines 29-33).

**Regarding claim 21,** the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 19, teaches that the controller detects a signal (connection of the camera to the docking station; see Berstis; col. 4, lines 35-63) to cause the digital image storage to receive digital images transmitted through the docking station, and wherein the controller automatically prepares the folder in the storage medium in response to the signal (See Kawamura et al., col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33; col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19). Grounds for rejecting claim 19 apply here.

**Regarding claim 22,** limitations can be found in claim 3.

**7. Claims 20, 21, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis, US Patent 6,721,001 B1 and Anderson, US Patent 6,507,363 B1 in view of Kawamura et al., US Patent 5,899,581 and further in view of Nambudiri, US Patent 6,640,214 B1.**

**Regarding claim 20,** the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 19, teaches that the controller detects a signal from the camera and automatically prepares the folder in response to the signal but fails to teach that the controller detects said signal from the docking station.

However, Nambudiri teaches the concept of having a system wherein when a docking station detects the presence or connection of another device, said docking station sends a receipt signal to said processing device to inform that a terminal has been connected to said docking station. Nambudiri teaches a cradle (see fig. 21) located apart from a host computer (Fig. 21: 1646) comprising a terminal detection module (Fig. 22: 1704) for detecting the connection of a portable terminal (Fig. 21: 1610), wherein when said terminal detection module detects the connection of said portable terminal, a microprocessor (Fig. 21: 1632) of said cradle controls a synchronization module (Fig. 21: 1706) to automatically synchronize data between the portable terminal and said host computer (Col. 17, line 55 – col. 19, line 53).

While it may not be explicitly stated in the references above that the functionality of an electronic device such as a system comprising a docking station for a system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader may be realized by a system comprising a docking station for a digital camera, it is well known to a skilled artisan that digital cameras and barcode readers are in the same field of endeavor as they are both microcontroller/microprocessor controlled devices for processing data, such as imaging, image processing, and/or image manipulation and perform image capture operations.

Even if a system comprising a docking station for a digital camera and a system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader are not in the same field of endeavor, which the examiner does not concede, the system comprising a docking station for a digital camera and the system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader are reasonably pertinent to solving the problem of indicating to a storage device or

Art Unit: 2622

computer device whether an external apparatus is connected a the docking station to establish communication between the external apparatus and the computer device or storage in order to synchronize data between the two devices and would have commended themselves to an artisan addressing such a problem. In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 658, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis and Anderson in view of Kawamura et al. and further in view of Nambudiri as a whole at the time the invention was made, one of an ordinary skill in the art would find obvious to apply the concept of having a system wherein when a docking station detects the presence or connection of another device, said docking station sends a receipt signal to said processing device to inform that a terminal has been connected to said docking station taught by Nambudiri to have the digital image storage in Berstis detecting a receipt signal from the docking station indicating that the camera is connected to said docking station prior to start performing the data transmission between the camera and the digital image storage. The motivation to do so would have been to alleviate the need to automatically synchronize the image data of the camera with the image data of the computer upon connecting the camera to the docking station.

**Regarding claim 21**, the combined teaching of Berstis in view of Anderson and further in view of Kawamura et al. as discussed and analyzed in claim 19, teaches that the camera detects a signal (connection of the camera to the docking station; see Berstis; col. 4, lines 35-63) to cause the camera to send the digital images transmitted through the docking station to the digital image storage, and wherein the controller

automatically prepares the folder in the storage medium in response to the signal (See Kawamura et al., col. 4, line 62 – col. 5, line 33; col. 6, line 43 – col. 6, line 19) but fails to teach that the controller in the digital image storage detects said signal.

However, Nambudiri teaches the concept of having a system wherein when a docking station detects the presence or connection of another device, said docking station sends a receipt signal to said processing device to inform that a terminal has been connected to said docking station. Nambudiri teaches a cradle (see fig. 21) located apart from a host computer (Fig. 21: 1646) comprising a terminal detection module (Fig. 22: 1704) for detecting the connection of a portable terminal (Fig. 21: 1610), wherein when said terminal detection module detects the connection of said portable terminal, a microprocessor (Fig. 21: 1632) of said cradle controls a synchronization module (Fig. 21: 1706) to automatically synchronize data between the portable terminal and said host computer (Col. 17, line 55 – col. 19, line 53).

While it may not be explicitly stated in the references above that the functionality of an electronic device such as a system comprising a docking station for a system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader may be realized by a system comprising a docking station for a digital camera, it is well known to a skilled artisan that digital cameras and barcode readers are in the same field of endeavor as they are both microcontroller/microprocessor controlled devices for processing data, such as imaging, image processing, and/or image manipulation and perform image capture operations.

Even if a system comprising a docking station for a digital camera and a system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader are not in the same field of endeavor,

which the examiner does not concede, the system comprising a docking station for a digital camera and the system comprising a docking station for a barcode reader are reasonably pertinent to solving the problem of indicating to a storage device or computer device whether an external apparatus is connected to the docking station to establish communication between the external apparatus and the computer device or storage in order to synchronize data between the two devices and would have commended themselves to an artisan addressing such a problem. In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 658, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Berstis and Anderson in view of Kawamura et al. and further in view of Nambudiri as a whole at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious to apply the concept of having a system wherein when a docking station detects the presence or connection of another device, said docking station sends a receipt signal to said processing device to inform that a terminal has been connected to said docking station taught by Nambudiri to have the digital image storage in Berstis detecting a receipt signal from the docking station indicating that the camera is connected to said docking station prior to start performing the data transmission between the camera and the digital image storage. The motivation to do so would have been to alleviate the need to automatically synchronize the image data of the camera with the image data of the computer upon connecting the camera to the docking station.

**Regarding claim 23**, limitations have been discussed and analyzed in claims 19 and 20. Therefore, grounds for rejecting claims 19 and 20 apply here.

**Regarding claim 24, limitations can be found in claim 3.**

**Contact**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nelson D. Hernandez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7311. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 A.M. to 6:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lin Ye can be reached on (571) 272-7372. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nelson D. Hernandez  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2622

NDHH  
July 18, 2007

LIN YE  
SPE. ART UNIT 2622